

BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES  
CORY A. BIRNBERG (SBN 105468)  
703 Market Street Suite 600  
San Francisco, California 94103  
Telephone Number: (415) 398-1040  
Facsimile Number: (415) 398-2001

Barbara Norris (Ak. No. 8506070)  
LAW OFFICES OF BARBARA NORRIS  
645 W. Third Ave.  
Anchorage Alaska 99501  
Telephone Number: (907) 279-6621  
Facsimile Number: (907) 279-0199

Attorneys for Defendants  
Woodbine Alaska Fish Company,  
and Guy Ferrari Inc.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

CITICAPITAL COMMERCIAL CORP,  
Plaintiff,

v.

EGEGIK SPIRIT, official number 2999957,  
her equipment, gear, furniture, apparel,  
fixtures, tackle, boats, machinery, anchors  
and all appurtenances, in rem;  
NAKNEK SPIRIT, official number 585824,  
her equipment, gear, furniture, apparel,  
fixtures, tackle, boats, machinery, anchors  
and all appurtenances, in rem;  
WOODBINE ALASKA FISH CO.,  
in personam; and GUY FERRARI, INC,  
in personam.

Defendants,

WOODBINE ALASKA FISH CO.,  
in personam; and GUY FERRARI, INC,  
in personam.

Cross-Complainant

v.

CITICAPITAL COMMERCIAL CORP

Cross-Defendant

**Case No. A-04-0147 CI  
IN ADMIRALTY**

**FIRST AMENDED COUNTER  
CLAIM OF WOODBINE  
ALASKA FISH CO., AND GUY  
FERRARI INC.**

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

**COUNTERCLAIM**

Cross-Complainant WOODBINE ALASKA FISH COMPANY, INC. and GUY FERRARI, INC. allege against CITICAPITAL COMMERCIAL CORP., as follows:

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

1. Cross-Complainant WOODBINE ALASKA FISH COMPANY, INC (hereinafter “Woodbine”) is and at all times relevant herein mentioned was an Alaskan Corporation.

2. Cross-Complainant GUY FERRARI, INC. (hereinafter “GFI”) is and at all times relevant herein was a California corporation doing business in the State of Alaska.

3. Cross-Defendant CITICAPITAL COMMERCIAL CORP. (hereinafter “CitiCapital”) is and at all times relevant herein mentioned was a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas and has voluntarily submitted to the jurisdiction of this court.

4. On or about July 17, 2004, CitiCapital, allegedly acting pursuant to a preferred ship mortgage [“note”], arrested the vessels NAKNEK SPIRIT, and the EGEGIK SPIRIT [“the vessels”].

5. When the vessels were arrested Woodbine had paid the note down to about \$334,000 and was in arrears on the note in the sum of \$43,940.82.

6. As to all causes of action herein pled, the Cross-Complainants have suffered the damages alleged in paragraphs 7-9 below as a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital’s conduct:

7. Woodbine traditionally buys a significant portion of its product after July 17<sup>th</sup> each year, considered the “Fall Fishery.” Without the use of the arrested vessels,

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

Woodbine missed its traditional Fall Fisheries, and therefore lost profits on the associated products. In addition, Woodbine hired an additional tender (the BRUIN BAY) to do its freight hauling, etc., at an additional expense of \$2,000 per day while the vessels remained under arrest. Woodbine paid its crew for a week while CitiCapital's attorney pretended to be negotiating in good faith. Arrangements were made to send the crew home, and CitiCapital interfered with Woodbine's relationship with its crew, and hired them away from Woodbine.

8. Woodbine lost profits in an amount in the approximate sum as follows:

Average for the past 3 seasons is:

1,432,918 lbs @ .75 recovery = 1,074,688 lbs net @ \$1.45/lb. = **\$1,558,298**

**Less COSTS**

Fish Cost @ .40/lb = \$573,167  
Taxes 22,927

**Tender costs** **75,000**  
Labor costs 214,937  
Package/freight-paid

**NET LOSS** **\$ 672,267**  
Plus tender cost

**Bruin Bay** **\$ 36,000**

**TOTAL** **\$ 708,267**

9. Woodbine suffered an additional loss for the crew that was standing by, as well as additional losses for Kuskokwim as follows. Traditionally, Woodbine purchased in the range of 350,000 – 750,000 lbs of Coho in the Kuskokwim during this time period as well.

Based on this range, average of 500,000 lbs of Coho, the following formula would

be: 500,000 lbs @ .75 recovery = 375,000 lbs net @ 1.25/lb. = \$468,750.00

Fish Cost @ .25/lb = \$125,000  
FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1 Taxes 5,000  
 2 Tender Costs (incl)  
 3 Labor (incl)  
 4 Package/freight-paid

5 **NET LOSS**

6 **\$338,750** Kuskokwim

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT**

8 10. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
 9 paragraphs 1 through 9 of this cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

10 11. On or about July 24, 2004, Woodbine, by and through its representative,  
 11 Virginia Ferrari, entered into a contract with CitiCapital, by and through its  
 12 representative Mark Manning whereby, in exchange and in consideration for Woodbine  
 13 obtaining insurance on the vessels, and making up the arrearages from fish sale proceeds,  
 14 CitiCapital agreed to release the vessels. Woodbine and CitiCapital, by and through the  
 15 aforementioned representatives, agreed to these terms.

16 12. Cross-Complainants have performed all conditions, covenants, and  
 17 promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and  
 18 conditions of the contract.

19 13. On or about July 25, 2004, CitiCapital breached the contract when it  
 20 refused to release the vessels, instead demanding additional terms and payments beyond  
 21 the contract.

22 14. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to the agreement, that  
 23 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
 24 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
 25 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
 26 with the contract.

27 FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM  
 28

1 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
2 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.

3 15. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's breach of  
4 contract, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages as a result of the  
5 abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
6

7 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT**

8 16. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
9 paragraphs 1 through 15 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

10 17. On or about July 25, 2004, Woodbine, by and through its representative,  
11 Virginia Ferrari, entered into a contract with CitiCapital, by and through its  
12 representative Mark Manning whereby, in exchange and in consideration for Woodbine  
13 paying the sum of \$43,940.82, the total amount of the arrearages, CitiCapital agreed to  
14 release the vessels. Woodbine and CitiCapital, by and through the aforementioned  
15 representatives, agreed to these terms.  
16

17 18. Cross-Complainants have performed all conditions, covenants, and  
18 promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and  
19 conditions of the contract.  
20

21 19. On or about July 26, 2004, CitiCapital breached the contract when it  
22 refused to release the vessels, instead demanding additional terms beyond the contract.

23 20. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to the agreement, that  
24 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
25 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
26 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
27  
28

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
2 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.

3 21. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's breach of  
4 contract, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages as a result of the  
5 abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
6

### 7 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT**

8 22. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
9 paragraphs 1 through 21 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

10 23. On or about July 26, 2004, Woodbine, by and through its representative,  
11 Virginia Ferrari, entered into a contract with CitiCapital, by and through its  
12 representative Mark Manning, whereby, in exchange and in consideration for Woodbine  
13 making a payment of the sum of \$79,487.65, allegedly representing \$43,940.82  
14 (principal), \$9,866.57, in late fees and \$25,660 in interest, and obtaining insurance  
15 coverage for the vessel, CitiCapital agreed to release the vessels. Woodbine and  
16 CitiCapital, by and through the aforementioned representatives, agreed to these terms.  
17

18 24. Cross-Complainants have performed all conditions, covenants, and  
19 promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and  
20 conditions of the contract.  
21

22 25. On or about July 26, 2004, CitiCapital breached the contract when it  
23 refused to release the vessels, instead demanding additional terms beyond the contract.

24 26. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to the agreement, that  
25 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
26 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
27 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
28

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
2 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.

3 27. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's breach of  
4 contract, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages as a result of the  
5 abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
6

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT**

8 28. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
9 paragraphs 1 through 27 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

10 29. On or about August 1, 2004, Woodbine, by and through its representative,  
11 Cory A. Birnberg, entered into a contract with CitiCapital, by and through its  
12 representative Mark Manning, whereby, in exchange and in consideration for Woodbine  
13 making a payment of the sum of \$125,000 and obtaining insurance coverage for the  
14 vessels, CitiCapital agreed to release the vessels. Woodbine and CitiCapital, by and  
15 through the aforementioned representatives, agreed to these terms.  
16

17 30. On or about August 5, 2004, Cross-Complainants offered to perform their  
18 obligations under the agreement in good faith and unconditionally by tendering the  
19 \$125,000.00, and submitting proof of obtaining insurance coverage for the vessels, and  
20 demanded that CitiCapital perform the obligations on its part by releasing the vessels.  
21

22 31. Cross-Complainants have performed all conditions, covenants, and  
23 promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and  
24 conditions of the contract.  
25

26 32. On or about August 5, 2004 CitiCapital breached the oral agreement by  
27 refusing to release the vessels, instead demanding additional terms beyond the contract.  
28

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1           33. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to the agreement, that  
 2 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
 3 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
 4 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
 5 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
 6 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.  
 7

8           34. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's breach of  
 9 contract, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages as a result of the  
 10 abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
 11

#### 12           **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT**

13           35. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
 14 paragraphs 1 through 34 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

15           36. On or about August 6, 2004, Woodbine, by and through its representative,  
 16 Cory A. Birnberg, entered into a contract with CitiCapital, by and through its  
 17 representative Mark Manning whereby, in exchange and in consideration for Woodbine  
 18 making a payment of the sum of \$125,000 and obtaining excess insurance coverage for  
 19 the vessels, CitiCapital agreed to release the vessels. Woodbine and CitiCapital, by and  
 20 through the aforementioned representatives, agreed to these terms.  
 21

22           37. Cross-Complainants have performed all conditions, covenants, and  
 23 promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and  
 24 conditions of the contract.  
 25

26           38. On or about August 10, 2004 CitiCapital breached the contract by refusing  
 27 to release the vessels, instead demanding additional terms beyond the contract.  
 28

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM



1           39. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to the agreement, that  
 2 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
 3 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
 4 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
 5 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
 6 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.  
 7

8           40. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's breach of  
 9 contract, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages as a result of the  
 10 abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
 11

#### 12                   **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT**

13           41. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
 14 paragraphs 1 through 40 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

15           42. On or about August 10, 2004, Woodbine, by and through its  
 16 representative, Cory A. Birnberg, entered into a contract with CitiCapital, by and through  
 17 its representative Mark Manning whereby, in exchange and in consideration for  
 18 Woodbine making a payment of the sum of \$125,000, obtaining excess insurance  
 19 coverage for the vessels, and submitting a proposed business plan, CitiCapital agreed to  
 20 release the vessels. Woodbine and CitiCapital, by and through the aforementioned  
 21 representatives, agreed to these terms.  
 22

23           43. Cross-Complainants have performed all conditions, covenants, and  
 24 promises required on their part to be performed in accordance with the terms and  
 25 conditions of the contract.  
 26

27           44. On or about August 12, 2004 CitiCapital breached the contract by refusing  
 28 to release the vessels, instead demanding additional terms beyond the contract.

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1           45. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to the agreement, that  
 2 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
 3 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
 4 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
 5 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
 6 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.  
 7

8           46. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's breach of  
 9 contract, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages as a result of the  
 10 abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
 11

#### 12           **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – BAD FAITH BREACH OF CONTRACT**

13           47. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
 14 paragraphs 1 through 46 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

15           48. CitiCapital took advantage of the arrest of the vessels to extract more  
 16 money from Cross-Complainants than was due for arrearages of \$43,940.82, asking for  
 17 \$79,487.65 and then \$125,000, before the note was accelerated, constantly increasing the  
 18 amount that it would take, with no relational relationship to the amount of the arrearages  
 19 actually due on the note. Cross-Complainants were desperate to recommence fishing  
 20 operations, and had no choice but to agree to CitiCapital's increasingly exorbitant  
 21 demands.  
 22

23           49. CitiCapital's conduct in failing to honor each of the aforementioned  
 24 contracts, was willful, malicious, and oppressive, and done with the intent to permanently  
 25 deprive Cross-Complainants of their property, and/or with a conscious disregard of the  
 26 risk that such conduct, could cause a cessation of Cross-Complainant's business  
 27 operations.  
 28

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1           50. Cross-Complainants seek punitive damages against CitiCapital for the  
2 conscious and willful deprivation of their property.

3                   **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION – WRONGFUL FAILURE TO RELEASE**  
4                   **VESSELS**

5           51. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
6 paragraphs 1 through 50 of this Cross-complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.

7           52. When the vessels were arrested on July 17, 2004, Woodbine had paid the  
8 note down to about \$334,000 and was in arrears on the note in the sum of \$43,940.82.

9           53. Cross-Complainants informed CitiCapital, prior to any negotiations, that  
10 Cross-Complainants needed the vessels to operate its fishing business, and that every day  
11 that went by without the vessels being released would cause them to incur tremendous  
12 lost profits, costs associated with having a crew standing by, and other losses associated  
13 with an abrupt cessation of operations during what would otherwise be the most lucrative  
14 time of the year for Cross-Complainants.

15           54. On or about July 24, 2004, Cross-Complainants agreed to obtain insurance  
16 coverage and pay arrearages from the proceeds of fish sales in exchange for CitiCapital's  
17 release of the vessels. CitiCapital refused to honor the agreement.

18           55. On or about July 25, 2004, Cross-Complainants agreed to pay arrearages up  
19 front in exchange for CitiCapital's release of the vessels. CitiCapital refused to honor the  
20 agreement.

21           56. On or about July 26, 2004, Cross-Complainants agreed to pay \$79,487.65  
22 and obtain insurance coverage in exchange for CitiCapital's release of the vessels.  
23 CitiCapital refused to honor the agreement.

24  
25  
26 FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1           57. On or about August 1, 2004, Cross-Complainants agreed to pay \$125,000  
2 and obtain insurance coverage in exchange for CitiCapital's release of the vessels.

3 CitiCapital refused to honor the agreement.

4           58. On or about August 6, 2004, Cross-Complainants agreed to pay \$125,000  
5 and obtain excess insurance coverage in exchange for CitiCapital's release of the vessels.

6 CitiCapital refused to honor the agreement.

7           59. On or about August 6, 2004, Cross-Complainants agreed to pay \$125,000,  
8 obtain excess insurance coverage, and submit a proposed business plan in exchange for  
9 CitiCapital's release of the vessels. CitiCapital refused to honor the agreement.

10           60. Cross-Complainants are informed and believe that the terms of these  
11 agreements were not properly conveyed from counsel for CitiCapital to the correct  
12 decisions-maker at CitiCapital, and that CitiCapital was acting in bad faith. Cross-  
13 Complainants are informed and believe that CitiCapital had no intention of ever releasing  
14 the vessels, despite being fully aware that the income, profitability, and ongoing business  
15 of Woodbine depended upon the functioning of the tenders in buying fish, and that once  
16 the tenders were arrested by CitiCapital, Woodbine could not buy any fish and was  
17 essentially out of business.

18           61. Based upon either the surveys of Cross-Complainants, already on file  
19 in this action, or the surveys produced by CitiCapital, the arrest of one vessel was  
20 sufficient security for the amount of the arrearages of \$43,940.82. The failure of  
21 CitiCapital to release both vessels was therefore wrongful and in bad faith.

22           62. The failure to release both vessels for the outstanding obligations of  
23 Cross-Complainants was wrongful, malicious, and designed to harm Cross-  
24 Complainants and each of them, and was done with conscious disregard of the risk

25 FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1 that it could result in the cessation of Woodbine's entire fishing operations and/or  
 2 with intent to harm Cross-Complainants.

3 63. Concurrently with negotiating and making the first four aforementioned  
 4 agreements, CitiCapital was drafting a First Amended Complaint, wherein CitiCapital  
 5 accelerated the entire balance due on the note, and CitiCapital therefore never intended to  
 6 act in good faith in honoring those agreements.  
 7

8 64. As a further result of, and proximately caused by, CitiCapital's wrongful  
 9 failure to release the vessels, Cross-Complainants have suffered consequential damages  
 10 as a result of the abrupt cessation of operations, in an amount according to proof.  
 11

12 65. As a result of CitiCapital's wrongful failure to release the vessels,  
 13 Cross-Complaints have been damaged in a sum in no less than \$1.2 million in lost  
 14 profits, crew fees, and charges.

15 66. Cross-Complainants seek punitive damages against CitiCapital for  
 16 the conscious and willful deprivation of their property.  
 17

18 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION – BREACH OF IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD  
 FAITH AND FAIR DEALING**

19 67. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege each of the allegations contained in  
 20 paragraphs 1 through 66 of this Complaint as if each was more fully set forth herein.  
 21

22 68. Cross-Complainants are informed and believe that the terms of these  
 23 agreements were not properly conveyed from counsel for CitiCapital to the correct  
 24 decisions-maker at CitiCapital, and that CitiCapital was acting in bad faith.

25 69. Cross-Complainants are informed and believe that CitiCapital had no  
 26 intention of ever releasing the vessels, and that during negotiations and the first four  
 27 agreements to release the vessels, CitiCapital was drafting a First Amended Complaint,  
 28

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

1 wherein CitiCapital accelerated the entire balance due on the note. CitiCapital therefore  
 2 never ever intended to release the vessels as agreed, or act in good faith pursuant to its  
 3 agreements.

4 70. The actions of CitiCapital, set forth hereinabove, in consciously and  
 5 deliberately acting unfairly and frustrating the agreed common purpose of the contracts and  
 6 disappointing the reasonable expectations of Cross-Complainants, constitute a violation of  
 7 the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in the underlying note and in  
 8 each of the contracts alleged above.  
 9

10 71. CitiCapital's actions, in violating the implied covenant of good faith and fair  
 11 dealing, have directly and proximately caused Cross-Complainants to suffer damages in an  
 12 amount according to proof.  
 13

14 **WHEREFORE**, Cross-Complainants pray for relief from CitiCapital, as follows:

15 1. For general damages in a sum within the jurisdiction of this Court and in an  
 16 amount to be determined at trial;

17 2. For special damages including but not limited to the cost of goods and  
 18 services Cross-Complainants became liable for as consequence of CitiCapital's conduct,  
 19 and other incidental and consequential damages, in an amount to be determined at trial;  
 20

21 3. For lost profits in an amount to be determined at trial;

22 4. For punitive damages in an amount according to proof;

23 5. For other damages not yet ascertained, in an amount to be determined at  
 24 trial;

25 6. For costs of suit herein incurred and prejudgment interest;  
 26

1                   7.       For all such additional relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

2       Dated: 17 April 2006

BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES

3                   By: s/Cory Birnberg  
4                   Cory A. Birnberg

5                   BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES  
6                   CORY A. BIRNBERG  
7                   703 Market Street Suite 600  
8                   San Francisco, California 94103  
9                   Telephone Number: (415) 398-1040  
10                  Facsimile Number: (415) 398-2001  
11                  Email: [birnberg@birnberg.com](mailto:birnberg@birnberg.com)  
12                  California State Bar No. 105468  
13                  Attorneys for Cross-Complainants

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26       BIRNBERG &  
27       ASSOCIATES  
28       703 MARKET STREET  
      SUITE 600  
      SAN FRANCISCO  
      CA, 94103  
      TEL (415) 398-1040  
      FAX (415) 398-2001

FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM